

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Submitted herewith are six replacement sheets for 1, 2, 4, 9, 14 and 15.

## REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15-17 and 22, amended the specification, amended the abstract and the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to the claims, specification, abstract and drawings are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Accordingly, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims, specification, abstract and drawings as amended.

Firstly, the Examiner states that the listing of references in the specification is not proper and requires a separate listing. In reply thereto, Applicant has supplied a separate list by the information disclosure statement made February 11, 2005.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Submitted herewith are replacement sheets for Figs. 1, 2, 4, 9, 14 and 15. In view of these amendments to the drawings, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure, stating that the specification refers to claims numerous times at pages 5-12 which may create discrepancies and new matter issues if future claims amendments were to be made. In reply thereto, Applicant respectfully submits that the numbers contained at page 5-12 do not refer to the claims and instead refer to the previously numbered paragraphs at page 3-12 of Applicant's application.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract for containing legal phraseology. Applicant has amended the abstract and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification where indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-22 because of certain informalities. Applicant has amended the claims where indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully submits that they are not now indefinite and comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 14-17 and 22 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Arai et al., stating that Arai et al. discloses each and every element of Applicant's invention.

In reply to this rejection, Applicant has carefully reviewed Arai et al. and respectfully submits that while Arai et al. may teach an X-ray generator and an X-ray sensor which are rotated

about an object, Arai et al. does not disclose that the object is moved during X-ray photography. In contrast thereto, in Applicant's invention as claimed by the claims, the object is moved while fixing the rotary center of the rotary arm during the first X-ray photography.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Arai et al. does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's invention and claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 14-17 and 22 are not anticipated thereby.

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Arai et al. in view of Suzuki et al., stating that Arai et al. discloses all of the elements of the present invention except executing time delay integration processing; Suzuki et al. teaches executing time delay integration processing; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai et al. as in view of the teachings of Suzuki et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Arai et al. In addition, Applicant has carefully reviewed Suzuki et al. and respectfully submits that Suzuki et al. does not teach that the object is moved during the first X-ray photography.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Arai et al. and Suzuki et al. is not Applicant's invention and claim 3 is not obvious thereover.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Arai et al. '842 in view of Arai et al. WO 00/57789 and Fujimoto, stating that Arai et al. '842 discloses all of the elements of the present invention except for an object holding means that has a chair for holding a patient in a sitting position and a head fixing means at the upper part of the chair and wherein the object holding means further has a pulse motor for moving said object in an axial direction of an X-ray rotary axis or in a vertical direction of an X-ray rotary axis; Arai et al. '789 teaches an object holding means having a chair at page 28, lines 4-10 for holding a patient (Fig. 10, R) in a sitting position and a head fixing means 4a, 4b at the upper part of the chair and wherein said object holding means further has a motor 41 for moving the object in an axial direction of an X-ray rotary axis; Fujimoto et al. teaches a pulse motor; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai et al. '842 with the chair of Arai et al. '789 and the pulse motor of Fujimoto et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Arai et al. '842. In addition, Applicant has carefully

reviewed Arai et al. '789 and respectfully submits that at page 28, lines 4-10, it merely describes a head holding means 4 which includes a chin rest 4a and a head fixing means 4b for an object R. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no chair described or shown at all. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that the object holding means 4 is driven by the motors 41a, 41b and 41c in the X,Y and Z directions to adjust the chin rest 4a and head fixing means 4b.

Still further, Applicant has further carefully reviewed Fujimoto et al. and respectfully submits that Fujimoto et al. merely discloses the use of a pulse motor to move the table in a CT scanner.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination suggested by the Examiner is not Applicant's invention and claims 8 and 9 are not obvious over Arai et al. '789 in view of Arai et al. '789 and further in view of Fujimoto et al.


Applicant further respectfully and retroactively requests a one month extension of time to respond to the Office Action. Please charge Deposit Account No. 11-1445 in the sum of \$120.00 as the fee.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By:   
William L. Androlia  
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East  
Suite 1140  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983  
Tel: (310) 277-1391  
Fax: (310) 277-4118

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

May 15, 2007

Date of Deposit

William L. Androlia

Name

Signature

5/15/2007

Date